Remarks

In the January 14th Office Action, claims 1, 2, 6, 8-12, 14-18, 20-22, 43, 44, 48, 50-54, 56, 59-65, 67-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,694,323 ("Koropitzer et al."); claims 26 and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koropitzer et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,707,848 ("Durston et al."); claims 3, 23-25, 45, 47 and 58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koropitzer et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,961,561 ("Wakefield"); claims 4 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koropitzer et al. in view of Wakefield and further in view of Durston et al.; claims 5 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koropitzer et al. in view of Wakefield and further in view of Durston et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,619,183 ("Ziegra et al."); claims 7, 19, 45 and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koropitzer et al. in view of Ziegra et al; and claims 13 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koropitzer et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,693,911 ("Walker et al").

As a result of this Amendment, claims 14-26 and 56-69 are hereby canceled without prejudice and dependent claims 80-97 are hereby added. Claims 1-13, 43-55 and 80-87 are therefore pending in the present application. Additionally, claims 1, 3-6, 10-12, 43, 45-48 and 52-54 have been amended as listed above. Reconsideration of the instant rejections is respectfully requested in view of these amendments in conjunction wtih the remarks below.

A. Interview Summary

The undersigned kindly thanks Examiner Dixon for his time in preparing for and attending a 37 C.F.R. § 1.133 interview on March 24, 2005, in which the undersigned and Mr. Dixon discussed the substance of the above-noted rejections. In this interview, the undersigned and Examiner Dixon discussed the proposed cancellations of claims 14-26 and 56-69 as well as Koropitzer as the base prior art reference used to reject all pending claims in the present application. The following remarks are intended to not only fully respond to the final Office Action dated January 14, 2005, but also provide a complete and accurate record of the substance of the interview conducted on March 24, 2005.

B. Rejections to Claims 1-13 and 43-55 in view of Koropitzer

In general, claims 1 and 43 are directed to a computer-implemented method for providing advisory information to field service providers communicating with a server computer by way of network devices. For example, the advisory information may include an indication of how operating parameters of a specific utility device relate to a set of threshold operating conditions. Both claims 1 and 43 recite retrieval of advisory information from a storage module based on a provider identification code associated with the field service provider.

Turning now to Koropitzer, which generally describes a process and system for monitoring the amount of revenue generated by and the repair history for remote laundromats having laundry machines. Koropitzer teaches that monitoring cash collections can lead to various types of analyses regarding the financial aspects of operating laundromats and that monitoring repair history can indicate whether a malfunctioned machine has been repaired. Such monitoring is administered by a network having a main controller unit (MCU) and multiple site controller units (SCU). The SCU's are located at each of the remote laundromats and collect information regarding cash collections and repair history for communication to the MCU. In this regard, the location of the MCU is referred to in Koropitzer as a "monitoring site." See Koropitzer, at Col. 12, line 60.

The undersigned and Examiner Dixon discussed claims 1 and 43 in view of the teachings of Koropitzer, but did not come to any agreement relative to the patentability of these claims over Koropitzer. Instead, the direction of the interview proceeded to the discussion of potential amendments to independent claims 1 and 43 in hopes of identifying agreeable subject matter. In this regard, the undersigned and Examiner Dixon discussed amending claims 1 and 43 as set forth above in the Listing of the Claims and the teachings (or lack thereof) of Koropitzer in view of these added recitations.

Specifically, claims 1 and 43 are hereby amended to recite the storage and retrieval of advisory information based on the specific data types from which the advisory information is derived, as discussed in the March 24th interview. The advisory information is categorized within the storage module in data type records based on the data type associated with the advisory information (i.e., the data type from which the advisory information is derived). In response to receiving a request from a specific field service provider for presentation of advisory information, claims 1 and 43 recite the use of the specific field service provider's provider

identification code to accomplish retrieval of advisory information from storage, and more particularly, from a "specific" data type record.

With regard to Koropitzer, Applicant submits, and the undersigned noted in the March 24th interview, that FIG. 11 and the associated text in Col. 39, line 21 - Col. 41, line 18 do not teach the retrieval of advisory information from specific data type records based on a provider identification code, as asserted in support for the rejections to claims 11 and 53 in the January 14th Office Action. See Office Action, at page 4. Even further, this cited passage does not even teach the association of advisory information with specific data types. Rather, this portion of Koropitzer describes the association of laundry machines to specific machine types. See Col. 40, lines 58-65.

Also, in the March 24th interview, the undersigned and Examiner Dixon discussed FIG. 16 and Col. 46, line 50 - Col. 47, lines 18 as applied to claims 1 and 43 in view of the impending amendments. In general, this cited section of Koropitzer generally describes three different types of users each having a different access level with regard to information that may be presented to the users. However, FIG. 16 and Col. 46, line 50 - Col. 47, lines 18 only describe, at a high level, the limitations placed on certain users to retrieve information and fail altogether to enable the specifics by which the authorized information is retrieved for such users.

Accordingly, amended claims 1 and 43 are believed distinguished from Koropitzer and, thus, in condition for allowance. Consequently, claims 2-13, which depend from claim 1, and claims 44-55, which depend from claim 43, are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

C. New Claims 80-97

New claims 80-97 are hereby added into the application and recite various embodiments of the present invention relative to the amended claim scope of claims 1 and 43. In this regard, claims 80-88 depend from claim 1 and claims 89-97 depend from claim 43. For at least the reasons noted above in connection with claims 1 and 43, claims 80-97 are also believed allowable over the art of record.

CONCLUSION

This Amendment fully responds to the Office Action mailed on January 14, 2005 as well as summarize the substance of the Rule 133 interview conducted on March 24, 2005. While the January 14th Office Action may contain arguments and rejections and that are not directly addressed by this Amendment, these arguments/rejections are rendered moot in view of the preceding arguments in favor of patentability. Accordingly, failure of this Amendment to directly address an argument raised in the January 14th Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicant believes the argument to have merit. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Hence, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to all other bases of patentability.

As respectfully requested in the March 24th interview, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned by telephone to expeditiously resolve any further concerns regarding the patentability of the present application in view of Koropitzer. Because the number of claims now pending in this application (due to the Amendment) is less than the number of claims previously paid for, no fees are believed due for the submission of this Amendment. However, if this is not the case, please charge any such fees to Deposit Account No. 13-2725. Additionally, if any extension of time fees are required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) to maintain the pendency of this application, please also charge Deposit Account No. 13-2725 the amount of such requisite fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 14, 2005

David D. Wier, Attorney Reg. No. 48,229
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
(303) 357-1647

23552
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE